

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 22, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 10 and 14 are amended; as a result, claims 10-16 and 18-34 are now pending in this application.

'102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 10-16 and 18-34 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Jawahar et al. (hereinafter "Jawahar") U.S. Patent No. 6,298,356. Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 10 and 14 are amended solely to provide proper antecedent basis and clarity. Jawahar describes a system wherein a customer accesses a web page using the customer's computer and browser, is connected to a sales agent who is using the agent's browser and computer, and the customer and agent are connected to one another to converse by text windows and/or telephone. Jawahar lacks a transaction stored into a database by the customer and another transaction stored into the database by the agent, to which access is enabled to the customer and the transactions accessed by the customer. The Office Action points to Fig 5 blocks 176-182; however, these do not show a transaction received from the agent (i.e., service provider). The Office Action points to storing the requested web pages into a cache, but this does not store any "transaction" into a database. The Office Action points to tables of information accessed by the customer; however, this is a log of web pages accessed and time spent at each, and is not enabling access to the customer (i.e., service consumer) to transactions stored in the database based on an identification of the customer, but rather only a log. The customer is sent web pages to look at and text (from the agent) to read, but does not have access enabled to obtain transaction information from a database. On column 4 lines 10-24, Jawahar does not list database transactions, but rather lists: "Exemplary transactions in a transaction processing environment include telephone calls, facsimile transmissions, electronic mail (e-mail), video sessions, or network sessions (such as an Internet session). A particular transaction can be either inbound (e.g., received by a transaction processing system) or outbound (e.g., transmitted from a transaction processing system).

A transaction processing system is any device capable of receiving, transmitting, queuing, routing, or otherwise processing a transaction. A transaction processing system may also handle mixed transactions (e.g., receive a telephone call and respond to the telephone call using e-mail). Example transaction processing systems include automatic call distributors (ACDs), call centers, and other telephone call processing devices."

In contrast, the present invention as recited in claims 10 and 14 provides a method (or media having the method) comprising:

receiving a plurality of transactions for the database system including a first transaction from a service provider and a second transaction from a service consumer, wherein the first and the second transactions are each associated with the service consumer;

storing the plurality of transactions into the database system; and

selectively enabling access by the service consumer, based on an identification of the service consumer, to the stored first and second transactions associated with the service consumer to whom access is enabled.

This distinguishes the present invention from Jawahar. Accordingly, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of these claims and their dependent claims is respectfully requested.

As to claims 11, 15, and 32, Jawahar describes "an expiration date of the requested resource determines whether the requested resource should be cached," but does not describe a docketing provider (i.e., wherein the due date for performance of various items is specified according to rules for each item). In contrast, the present invention is useful for such professions as law and others wherein due dates are routinely provided. The Office Action has failed to provide a prima facie case of anticipation. The claimed combination where the method further includes "receiving transactions by a docketing provider" is clearly distinguished. Accordingly, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

As to claims 12, 20, 26 and 33, Jawahar describes logging past web accesses and communicating changes in the agent's and customer's pages, but does not describe logging action items (i.e., items wherein action is required for each item). In contrast, this feature of the present invention is useful for such professions as law and others. Accordingly, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

As to claim 16, Jawahar describes logging past web accesses and communicating changes in the agent's and customer's pages, but does not describe logging action items (i.e., items wherein action is required for each item). In contrast, the present invention is useful for such professions as law and others. Reconsideration and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.

As to claim 18, this claim and its dependent claims are means-plus-function claims, and must be examined under 35 USC 112 paragraph 6, to be the structure and acts described in the present invention and equivalents thereof. The Office Action has failed to provide a reference with the required equivalents as analyzed under 35 USC 112 paragraph 6. Accordingly, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

As to claims 22 and 28, Jawahar does not describe extracting a database transaction from an electronic message. Accordingly, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

As to claims 23 and 29, Jawahar does not describe an input device for a database transaction, but rather a generic input device. Applicant cannot find any indication that this input device is used for entering a database transaction in Jawahar. Accordingly, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

As to the remaining claims not separately discussed above, each is dependent on a claim that appears allowable, as discussed above. Further, each describes further limitations that form a combination with the respective parent claim, and these combinations are also not described in the cited reference. Accordingly, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((952) 278-3501) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES A. LEMAIRE ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

((952) 278-3501)

Date

23 December 2003

By

Charles A. Lemaire

Charles A. Lemaire

Reg. No. 36,198

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 23 day of December, 2003.

GREGORY A. LEMAIRE

Name

G.A. Lemaire

Signature